

Remarks/Arguments

This confirms a telephone discussion between Examiner Shiferaw and Daniel E. Sragow, Consultant for Thomson, on 29 December 2005.

In paragraph 1 of the Final Rejection, the Examiner fails to mention the amendments to the Abstract, which were included with Applicants' amendment filed on 18 August 2005. In the Office Action Summary of the Final Rejection, item 9 is checked. It would therefore appear that the Examiner has not considered the Abstract that Applicants submitted on 18 August 2005. Therefore, for the convenience of the Examiner, Applicants have attached a copy of page 2 of Applicants' amendment filed 18 August 2005, which contains a rewritten Abstract. The Applicants submit that the Examiner's objections to the specification are overcome in view of the rewritten Abstract.

Claims 1, 8, 9, 10 and 11 are currently amended. Claims 2-5 have been cancelled.

Rejection of claims 1 and 6-11 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Amico et al (US Pat No 5077790) in view of Bjorklund (EP 0658021A1)

Applicants submit that for the reasons discussed below present claims 1 and 6-11 are patentably distinguishable over the teachings of D'Amico in view of Bjorklund.

The present invention relates to a method for registering a device in a wireless network, in which the user has the option to install a device on a new network, and configuring the device to become the central controller of the new network. Nowhere is the inventive method shown or suggested by the cited prior art.

Claim 1 specifically recites the step of asking the user if he wants to install a new network. If the user wants to install a new network, the newly registered device becomes the central controller of the new network. Nowhere is this taught or suggested by U.S. Patent 5,077,790 to D'Amico et al. Rather, D'Amico et al. relate only to registration of cordless telephones on an existing network. Nowhere does D'Amico et al. teach or suggest a new device becoming a central controller of a new network, as specifically recited in Claim 1.

The Examiner has pointed to column 5, lines 22-26 of D'Amico et al. This portion of the reference relates to registration of a single device on a plurality of existing networks. Nowhere does the reference teach or suggest establishing a new network in which the new device is the central controller of the new network, as specifically set forth in Claim 1.

The Examiner has also pointed to column 3, lines 40-55 of D'Amico et al. This portion of the reference relates to registration of a new device on an existing network. Nowhere does the reference teach or suggest establishing a new network in which the new device is the central controller of the new network, as specifically set forth in Claim 1.

Bjorklund also fails to teach or suggest the above-mentioned feature of present claim 1. Bjorklund et al., relates to a wireless LAN having only a single central network manager. Although Bjorklund et al. teach multiple base stations, there is only one network and one central network manager.

The Examiner has pointed to column 5, line 57, to column 6, line 58, of Bjorklund et al., as disclosing installing a device on a new network. Applicants respectfully disagree that the cited portion of Bjorklund teaches this feature. Bjorklund et al. do not teach installing a new network. Rather, they teach installing a base station on an existing network. Furthermore, Bjorklund et al. do not enable a newly installed device to be the central controller of a new network, as specifically recited in Claim 1. It is therefore clear that Bjorklund et al. is no more relevant to the patentability of Claim 1 than the reference to D'Amico et al.

Claims 6-8 are dependent from Claim 1 and add further advantageous features. These subclaims are submitted to be patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as their parent Claim 1.


Claim 9 specifically recites installation of a new device on a new network, and the new device becoming the central controller of the new network. As discussed above, neither D'Amico et al. nor Bjorklund et al. teach or suggest this method. The Applicants therefore submit that Claim 9 is patentable over both cited references.

Claims 10 and 11 are dependent from Claim 9 and add further advantageous features. These subclaims are believed to be patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as their parent Claim 9.

Ser. No. 10/088,622
Internal Docket No. PF990063
Customer No. 24498

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6815, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,
ALAIN DURAND, ET AL.

By: 
Paul P. Kiel
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 40,677

THOMSON Licensing Inc.
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: January 23, 2006

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on:

1-23-06
Date

Karen Schleich